

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Nurah Rashida Safa,	)	Civil Action No.: 5:12-1252-MGL
	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>OPINION AND ORDER</u></b>
	)	
	)	
Carolyn W. Colvin,	)	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. Plaintiff Nurah Rashida Safa, (“Plaintiff”) brought this action seeking judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”).

On January 21, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation concluding that the Commissioner’s decision was not supported by substantial evidence. (ECF No. 30 at 13). Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the case be reversed and remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative proceedings to consider the opinion of Plaintiff’s treating psychiatrist, Dr. Elizabeth Leonard, and Plaintiff’s other treating and examining professionals. *Id.* at 14. On February 7, 2014, the Commissioner filed “Defendant’s Notice of Not Filing Objections to the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge.” (ECF No. 32).

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to him with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir.2005).

The Court has carefully reviewed the record and concurs in the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. The decision of the Commissioner to deny benefits is **reversed** and the action is **remanded** under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative action consistent with this order and the Report and Recommendation.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

February 10, 2014  
Spartanburg, South Carolina